

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following amendments and remarks contained herein in response to the Office Action mailed December 7, 2007. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments and remarks contained herein place the instant application in condition for allowance.

Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 21 – 22, 24, 26 – 29, 31, 33 – 37, and 39 – 45 are pending. In particular, Applicant adds claims 41 – 45, amends claims 21, 28, and 35, and cancels claims 23, 25, 30, 32, and 38. Applicant cancels claims 23, 25, 30, 32, and 38 merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if Applicant so chooses, and does not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Support for these amendments may be found in paragraphs [0025] – [0026] of the present application.

### **I. Examiner Interview**

Applicant first wishes to express sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Garg spent with Applicant's Attorney, Anthony Bonner, during a telephone discussion on February 13, 2008 regarding the outstanding Office Action. During that conversation, Examiner Garg and Mr. Bonner discussed potential arguments and amendments with regard to claim 21, in view of *Minte*. The general thrust of the potential principal arguments included a discussion of at least one embodiment of the present application disclosing the second search criteria being about the user. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner Garg carefully consider this response and the amendments.

## II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

### A. Claim 21 is Allowable Over *Minte* in view of *Fukatsu*

The Office Action indicates that claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Application Number 2002/0046118 ("*Minte*") in view of U.S. Patent Number 7,158,846 ("*Fukatsu*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reason that *Minte* in view of *Fukatsu* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 21. More specifically, claim 21 recites:

A system for communicating information about an advertisement, comprising:

logic in an advertisement content server configured to receive advertisement information associated with a plurality of advertisers;

logic in an advertisement content server configured to store the information as records within defined fields;

logic in an advertisement content server configured to provide, to a user, a search window that includes a plurality of search fields, the plurality of search fields configured to receive user-defined search criteria, the plurality of search fields including a first search field configured to facilitate a search of a predetermined first criteria, ***the first criteria being about the advertisement***, the plurality of search fields including a second search field configured to facilitate a search of a predetermined second criteria, ***the second criteria being about the user***, the plurality of search fields including a key field configured to facilitate a search across the first search field and the second search field;

logic in an advertisement content server configured to receive a search request from the user;

logic in an advertisement server configured to receive, from a user, at least one search term, the at least one search term being related to at least one of the defined fields;

logic in an advertisement content server configured to perform a search function according to the at least one search term; and

logic in an advertisement content server configured to transmit to the user at least a portion of information resulting from the search function.

***(emphasis added)***

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that neither *Minte* nor *Fukatsu*, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "system for communicating information about an advertisement, comprising... logic in an advertisement content server configured to provide, to a user, a search window that includes a plurality of search fields, the plurality of search fields configured to

receive user-defined search criteria, the plurality of search fields including a first search field configured to facilitate a search of a predetermined first criteria, ***the first criteria being about the advertisement***, the plurality of search fields including a second search field configured to facilitate a search of a predetermined second criteria, ***the second criteria being about the user***, the plurality of search fields including a key field configured to facilitate a search across the first search field and the second search field” as recited in claim 21, as amended. More specifically, the Office Action indicates that “Minte does not explicitly teach that the advertisement server is configured to... provide to user, a search window that includes a plurality of search fields, the plurality of search fields configured to receive user-defined search criteria...” (OA page 6, line 12).

Further, *Fukatsu* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Minte*. More specifically, *Fukatsu* discloses “[t]he user may select a search key item 75 and input a corresponding search key word 76 or may select on of some alternatives at 77” (column 7, line 15). Applicant respectfully submits, however, that nowhere does *Fukatsu* even suggest that the first criteria being about the advertisement and the second criteria being associated with the user. For at least the reason that the combination of references fails to disclose the elements of claim 21, as amended, this claim is allowable.

**B. Claim 28 is Allowable Over *Minte* in view of *Fukatsu***

The Office Action indicates that claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Application Number 2002/0046118 (“*Minte*”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 7,158,846 (“*Fukatsu*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reason that *Minte* in view of *Fukatsu* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 28. More specifically, claim 28 recites:

A method for communicating information about an advertisement,  
comprising:

receiving, by a computing device, advertisement information associated with a plurality of advertisers;

storing, by a computing device, the information as records within defined fields;

providing, by a computing device, to a user, a search window that includes a plurality of search fields, the plurality of search fields configured to receive user-defined search criteria, the plurality of search fields including a first search field configured to facilitate a search of a predetermined first criteria, ***the first criteria being about the advertisement***, the plurality of search fields including a second search field configured to facilitate a search of a predetermined second criteria, ***the second criteria being about the user***, the plurality of search fields including a key field configured to facilitate a search across the first search field and the second search field;

receiving, by a computing device, a search request from the user;

receiving, by a computing device at least one search term from a user, the at least one search term being associated with at least one of the defined fields;

performing a search function, by a computing device, according to the at least one search term; and

transmitting, by the computing device, at least a portion of information resulting from the search function to the user.

***(emphasis added)***

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 28, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that neither *Minte* nor *Fukatsu*, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a “method for communicating information about an advertisement, comprising... providing, by a computing device, to a user, a search window that includes a plurality of search fields, the plurality of search fields configured to receive user-defined search criteria, the plurality of search fields including a first search field configured to facilitate a search of a predetermined first criteria, ***the first criteria being about the advertisement***, the plurality of search fields including a second search field configured to facilitate a search of a predetermined second criteria, ***the second criteria being about the user***, the plurality of search fields including a key field configured to facilitate a search across the first search field and the second search field” as recited in claim 28, as amended. More specifically, the Office Action indicates that “Minte does not explicitly teach that the advertisement server is configured to... provide to user, a search window that includes a plurality of search fields, the plurality of search fields configured to receive user-defined search criteria...” (OA page 6, line 12).

Further, *Fukatsu* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Minte*. More specifically, *Fukatsu* discloses “[t]he user may select a search key item 75 and input a corresponding search key word 76 or may select on of some alternatives at 77” (column 7, line 15). Applicant respectfully submits, however, that nowhere does *Fukatsu* even suggest that the first criteria being about the advertisement and the second criteria being associated with the user. For at least the reason that the combination of references fails to disclose the elements of claim 28, as amended, this claim is allowable.

**C. Claim 35 is Allowable Over *Minte* in view of *Fukatsu***

The Office Action indicates that claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Application Number 2002/0046118 (“*Minte*”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 7,158,846 (“*Fukatsu*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reason that *Minte* in view of *Fukatsu* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 35. More specifically, claim 35 recites:

A computer readable medium for communicating information about an advertisement, comprising:

logic at a computing device configured to instruct a programmable device to receive advertisement information associated with a plurality of advertisers;

logic executable by a computing device configured to instruct a programmable device to store the information as records within defined fields;

logic executable by a computing device configured to instruct a programmable device to provide, to a user, a search window that includes a plurality of search fields, the plurality of search fields configured to receive user-defined search criteria, the plurality of search fields including a first search field configured to facilitate a search of a predetermined first criteria, ***the first criteria being about the advertisement***, the plurality of search fields including a second search field configured to facilitate a search of a predetermined second criteria, ***the second criteria being criteria about the user***, the plurality of search fields including a key field configured to facilitate a search across the first search field and the second search field;

logic executable by a computing device configured to instruct a programmable device to receive a search request from a logic executable by a computing device configured to instruct a programmable device to

receive at least one search term from the user; the at least one search term being associated with at least one of the defined fields;

logic executable by a computing device configured to instruct a programmable device to perform a search function according to the received search term; and

logic executable by a computing device configured to instruct a programmable device to transmit to the user at least a portion of information resulting from the search function.

**(emphasis added)**

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 35, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that neither *Minte* nor *Fukatsu*, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a “computer readable medium for communicating information about an advertisement, comprising... logic executable by a computing device configured to instruct a programmable device to provide, to a user, a search window that includes a plurality of search fields, the plurality of search fields configured to receive user-defined search criteria, the plurality of search fields including a first search field configured to facilitate a search of a predetermined first criteria, **the first criteria being about the advertisement**, the plurality of search fields including a second search field configured to facilitate a search of a predetermined second criteria, **the second criteria being criteria about the user**, the plurality of search fields including a key field configured to facilitate a search across the first search field and the second search field” as recited in claim 35, as amended. More specifically, the Office Action indicates that “Minte does not explicitly teach that the advertisement server is configured to... provide to user, a search window that includes a plurality of search fields, the plurality of search fields configured to receive user-defined search criteria...” (OA page 6, line 12).

Further, *Fukatsu* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Minte*. More specifically, *Fukatsu* discloses “[t]he user may select a search key item 75 and input a corresponding search key word 76 or may select on of some alternatives at 77” (column 7, line 15). Applicant respectfully submits, however, that nowhere does *Fukatsu* even suggest that the first criteria being about the advertisement and the second criteria being associated with the user. For at least the

reason that the combination of references fails to disclose the elements of claim 35, as amended, this claim is allowable.

**D. Claims 22, 24, 27, 29, 31, 34, 36 – 37, and 40 are Allowable Over *Minte* in view of *Fukatsu***

The Office Action indicates that claims 22, 24, 27, 29, 31, 34, 36 – 37, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Application Number 2002/0046118 (“*Minte*”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 7,158,846 (“*Fukatsu*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reason that *Minte* in view of *Fukatsu* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 22, 24, 27, 29, 31, 34, 36 – 37, and 40. More specifically, dependent claims 22 and 24 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 21. Dependent claims 27, 29, 31, and 34 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable independent claim 26. Further, dependent claims 36 – 37 and 40 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable independent claim 35. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

**E. Claims 26, 33, and 39 are Allowable Over *Minte* in view of *Fukatsu* further in view of *Stein***

The Office Action indicates that claims 26, 33 and 39 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Application Number 2002/0046118 (“*Minte*”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 7,158,846 (“*Fukatsu*”) further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,826,241 (“*Stein*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reason that *Minte* in view of *Fukatsu* further in view of *Stein* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 26, 33 and 39. More specifically, dependent claims 26 and 33 are believed to be allowable over *Minte* and *Fukatsu* for at least the reason that these claims depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 28. Further, dependent claim 39 is

believed to be allowable over *Minte* and *Fukatsu* for at least the reason that it depends from and includes the elements of allowable independent claim 35. Because *Stein* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Minte* and *Fukatsu*, claims 26, 33, and 39 are allowable as a matter of law. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

### **III. New Claims 41 – 45 are Allowable**

In addition, Applicant adds new claims 41 – 45. Claims 41 – 42 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 21. Claims 43 – 44 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 28. Claim 45 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 35. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).



## **CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/afb/

**Anthony F. Bonner Jr. Reg. No. 55,012**

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,  
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**  
Suite 1500  
600 Galleria Parkway N.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339  
(770) 933-9500  
Customer No.: **38823**